



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/684,685

10/15/2003

Yoshiyuki Wada

2003\_1405A

3411

513

7590

03/01/2005

WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P.  
2033 K STREET N. W.  
SUITE 800  
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1021

EXAMINER

PAREKH, NITIN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2811

DATE MAILED: 03/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/684,685

Applicant(s)

WADA ET AL.

Examiner

Nitin Parekh

Art Unit

2811

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 December 2004.  
2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9-13 and 15-26 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9-13 and 15-26 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
~~Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).~~  
~~Replacement drawing sheet(s) showing the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).~~  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                    | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 5, 11 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tobita et al. (US Pat. 2002/0058743) in view of Barton (US Pat. 5308980).

Regarding claims 1, 5 and 11, Tobita et al. disclose a semiconductor device comprising:

- a semiconductor element (12 in Fig. 2) having a first/bottom surface bearing external terminals (not numerically referenced- see Fig. 2) formed thereon for external connection and a second/top surface opposite the first surface, the external terminals being in a form of a bump/protrusion (see Fig. 2)
- a spreader plate/reinforcing plate (SP/RP-19 in Fig. 2) confronting the second/top surface, the SP/RP having an external shape being larger than that of the semiconductor element (see Fig. 2)
- a bonding layer of a resin polymer binder/adhesive (18 in Fig. 2) for bonding the second/top surface and the spreader/plate such that the semiconductor element is bonded to the SP/RP via the bonding layer, the resin/adhesive having

properties such as thermal coefficient of expansion (TCE), viscosity, modulus of elasticity (MOE), etc. to provide/allow the desired flexibility/deformation of the device package and associated components including the semiconductor element

- the resin polymer binder/adhesive comprising fillers including carbon fiber/powder and inorganic material such as aluminum oxide/nitride, silicon nitride, metallized resin/polymer (sections 0022-0039), the fillers having a distribution/range of particle size and diameter (sections 0022-0039)
- the bonding layer having a thickness as low as 50 microns (section 0058), and
- the device being mounted on a printed circuit board (PCB-see 11 in Fig. 2).

(Fig. 2; Fig. 1C/1D; sections 0064, 0021-0064).

Tobita et al. fail to teach a thickness of the semiconductor element being at most 100 microns.

Barton teaches a bonded integrated circuit (IC) device having thermally enhanced performance where the IC chip is conventionally lapped to a thickness as low as about 1 mil or 25 microns (12 in Fig. 3A/3B; Col. 4, lines 1-5) to provide the desired composite thermal expansion coefficient (TEC) for the bonded package (Col. 3, line 40-Col. 4, line 40; Col. 4-6).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to incorporate the thickness of the semiconductor element being at

Art Unit: 2811

most 100 microns as taught by Barton so that the desired composite TEC can be achieved and the package weight can be reduced in Tobita's device.

Regarding claim 25, Tobita et al. and Barton teach substantially the entire claimed structure as applied to claim 1 above, wherein Tobita et al. further teach the bonding layer/adhesive partially covering side edges of a plurality of electronic parts/semiconductor elements (see 13 and 16 respectively in Fig. 1D).

3. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tobita et al. (US Pat. 2002/0058743) and Barton (US Pat. 5308980) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Takano et al. (US Pat. 6376907).

Regarding claim 2, Tobita et al. and Barton teach substantially the entire claimed structure as applied to claim 1 above, except the bonding layer having a modulus of elasticity (MOE) of at most 10,000Mpa.

Takano et al. teach using a ball grid array device (Fig. 1A) having a chip being adhesively bonded to a cover plate (14 and 16 respectively in Fig. 1A) using an adhesive/resin (17 in Fig. 1A) where the adhesive/resin has a MOE of about 900Mpa to provide the desired warpage/stress reduction and improved bonding (see Table 2; Col. 5, line 40- Col. 7, line 13).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to incorporate the bonding layer having the MOE of at most

10,000Mpa as taught by Takano et al. so that the chip/plate bonding can be improved and the warpage/stress can be reduced in Barton and Tobita's device.

4. Claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 16, 18, 20, 21 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tobita et al. (US Pat. 2002/0058743) and Barton (US Pat. 5308980) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Distefano et al. (US Pat. 6255738).

Regarding claims 3, 4, 6 and 7, Tobita et al. and Barton teach substantially the entire claimed structure as applied to claim 1 above, wherein Tobita et al. teach the bonding layer being 50 microns thick, but fail to teach the bonding layer containing a filler having a diameter generally equal to the thickness of the bonding layer and the filler is in contact with the second surface of the semiconductor element respectively.

Distefano et al. teach using an encapsulant composition/resin (52 in Fig. 1) for a device to provide desired stress reduction, bonding, thermal expansion coefficient (CTE) and device protection (Col. 1-5) where the encapsulant/resin comprises:

- a number of fillers including a first, second and third filler, (Col. 2, lines 31-40; Col. 5, line 40- Col. 7, line 25; Col. 10)
- the first through third fillers having different particle size/diameter and size distribution/range including the size/diameter of about 50 microns, 2 microns and 0.1 microns respectively (Col. 6, lines 23, 33 and 67 respectively), and

- the first filler having the largest particle size/diameter among the fillers and the second filler having smaller particle size/diameter than that of the first filler

(Fig. 1; Col. 1-10).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to realize that the filler particle diameter of about 50 microns being equal to the thickness of the bonding layer would provide the filler being in contact with the second surface of the semiconductor element and the plate as taught by Distefano et al. so that the desired thermal and mechanical properties can be achieved in Barton and Tobita's device.

Regarding claims 16, 18 and 26, Tobita et al., Barton and Distefano et al. teach substantially the entire claimed structure as applied to claims 1 and 3 above.

Regarding claims 20 and 21, Tobita et al., Barton and Distefano et al. teach substantially the entire claimed structure as applied to claims 26, 18 and 1.

5. Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tobita et al. (US Pat. 2002/0058743) and Barton (US Pat. 5308980) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Inaba et al. (US Pat. 6387734).

Regarding claims 12 and 13, Tobita et al. and Barton teach substantially the entire claimed structure as applied to claim 1 above, except:

- the semiconductor element being provided with a re-wiring layer on the first surface having a surface electrode formed on the surface, and
- an internal electrode formed inside thereof where the internal electrode is in communication between said surface electrode and the terminal for external connection

Inaba et al. teach using a chip size package/CSP/IC element (see 4/1 in Fig. 3 and 4) having a configuration comprising:

- the IC element being provided with a re-wiring/rerouting layer on the first surface (6/2 in Fig. 3 and 4) having a surface electrode (see 8 in Fig. 3 and 4) formed on the surface, and
- an internal electrode (1a in Fig. 4) formed inside thereof where the internal electrode is in communication between the surface electrode and a terminal/bump electrode formed on the surface electrode (see 10 in Fig. 4) for external connection

(Fig. 3 and 4; Col. 4-7).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to incorporate the semiconductor element being provided with the



re-wiring layer on the first surface having a surface electrode formed on the surface and an internal electrode formed inside thereof where the internal electrode is in communication between the surface electrode and the terminal for external connection as taught by Inaba et al. so that the desired routing and electrode pad relocation can be achieved in Barton and Tobita's device.

6. Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tobita et al. (US Pat. 2002/0058743) and Barton (US Pat. 5308980) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Distefano et al. (US Pat. 6255738) and Takano et al. (US Pat. 6376907).

Regarding claims 9 and 10, Tobita et al., Distefano et al., Barton and Takano et al. teach substantially the entire claimed structure as applied to claims 1-3 and 8 above, wherein Distefano et al. teach the first filler being as low as 25 wt.% (Col. 7, line 10) such that it maintains a space between the second surface and the spreader/plate.

7. Claims 15, 23, 19 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tobita et al. (US Pat. 2002/0058743), Barton (US Pat. 5308980) and Distefano et al. (US Pat. 6255738) as applied to claims 1, 7, 26 and 18 above, and further in view of Shikata et al. (US Pat. 6255376).

Regarding claims 15, 19, 23 and 24, Tobita et al., Barton and Distefano et al. teach substantially the entire claimed structure as applied to claims 1, 7, 26 and 18 above, except a wt.% of the fillers including aggregate wt.% of the first and second fillers in the resin binder being at most 30 wt.%.

Shikata et al. teach a resin-bonded device (Fig. 2) having a variety of resin/filler compositions where the binder resin has a composition comprising 5 wt.% filler particles (Col. 8, line 37) to provide the desired thermal conductivity, mechanical strength, viscosity and uniformity (Col. 6-8; Col. 5-18). The filler particles further comprising a first and a second filler (see samples 20-22 in Table 1; Col. 18).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to incorporate a wt.% of the fillers including aggregated wt.% of the first and second fillers in the resin binder being 30 wt.% or less as taught by Shikata et al. so that the desired thermal and mechanical properties for the adhesive/resin can be achieved in Distefano et al., Barton and Tobita's device.

8. Claims 17 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tobita et al. (US Pat. 2002/0058743), Barton (US Pat. 5308980) and Distefano et al. (US Pat. 6255738) as applied to claims 14 and 18 above and further in view of Takano et al. (US Pat. 6376907).

Regarding claims 17 and 22, Tobita et al., Barton, Distefano et al., and Takano et al. teach substantially the entire claimed structure as applied to claims 26, 1 and 2.

***Response to Arguments***

9. Applicant's arguments filed on 12-14-04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

A. Applicant contends that it is not clear from Tobita et al. whether the semiconductor element is bonded to the plate prior to the semiconductor element 12 being connected to printed circuit board or whether the semiconductor element is first connected to the circuit board and then bonded to the plate.

However, the claims under examination are directed to the device structure and not a method of mounting the device on the PCB, therefore, the sequence of mounting is not applicable to the above rejection.

B. Applicant contends that the readout IC circuit in Barton is not a semiconductor element.

However, as explained above, Barton clearly teaches the thinned readout IC being the silicon IC chip/semiconductor element (see 12 in Fig. 3A/3B; Col. 4, lines 1-5 and 30-35, Col. 5, line 35-39, etc.).

C. Applicant contends that Distefano et al. do not disclose a filler that is used as a spacer to control the thickness of a bonding layer as with the instant invention.

However, the limitations as recited in claims 3 and 26 include the thickness of the filler in the bonding layer and that equal to the thickness of the bonding layer. Tobita et al teach the bonding layer having a thickness as low as 50 microns (section 0058). Distefano et al. the fillers having different particle size/diameter and size distribution/range including the size/diameter of about 50 microns (Col. 6, lines 23, 33 and 67 respectively). Therefore, Distefano et al. is combined with Tobita et al. for the above rejection. The claim limitations as recited in the claims 3 and 26, do not include the filler being used as a spacer to control the thickness of a bonding layer.

### ***Conclusion***

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2811

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nitin Parekh whose telephone number is 571-272-1663. The examiner can normally be reached on 09:00AM-05:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eddie Lee can be reached on 571-272-1732. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9318.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

NP

02-22-05



NITIN PAREKH

PRIMARY EXAMINER

Technology Center 2800